



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/595,620	05/01/2006	Hyun-Soo Kim	Q94674	3640		
23373	7590	06/04/2009	EXAMINER			
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				SAJJADI, FEREYDOUN GHOTB		
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER				
1633						
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE				
06/04/2009		PAPER				

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/595,620	KIM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	FEREYDOUN G. SAJJADI	1633	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) FEREYDOUN G. SAJJADI. (3) Janice Lee.

(2) Sunhee Lee. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 03 June 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Furcht et al. and Kokuzawa et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representatives indicated distinctions between the claimed invention and the methods of cell differentiation disclosed by Furcht et al. The Examiner noted that the language of instant claim 1 reads on the method steps of Furcht et al. and suggested amendment of base claim 1 to further distinguish the claim over the method steps set forth in the reference, for differentiation of bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Fereydoun G Sajjadi/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633	
--	--